

### **REMARKS**

The Abstract and Specification have been amended. Claims 1 - 6 and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments, all of which are supported in the application as originally filed. Claims 7 - 11 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice. Claims 1 - 6 and 12 are now in the application.

Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as claim amendments and cancellations in the present application are directed toward facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application and allowance of the currently-presented claims at an early date. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.

I. **Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §112, second paragraph**

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action dated January 25, 2008 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") states that Claims 3 - 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Appropriate amendments to Claim 3 are provided herein, and the Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §112, second paragraph rejection.

II. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §102(b)

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action states that Claims 1 - 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 6,731,393 to Currans et al. (hereinafter, “Currans”). Claims 7 - 11 have been cancelled from the application, rendering the rejection moot as to those claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to the remaining claims as currently presented.

With regard to Applicants’ independent Claim 1, the Office Action cites col. 4, lines 40 - 42 of Currans as teaching the “wherein a provider of the content has not provided a subscription interface thereto”, stating that content provider **50** and advertising provider **80** do not provide subscription interfaces in Currans, “they provide an interface to the edit module 120 ...”. Office Action, para. 5, lines 10 - 14.

Applicants have amended their claim language herein to recite that the renderer of the content does not provide a subscription interface (“... wherein a renderer of the view of the content has not provided a subscription interface thereto”, Claim 1, lines 4 - 5). Applicants respectfully submit that this is not taught, or suggested, by Currans. Notably, neither the content providers **50** or the advertising providers **80** in Currans are responsible for rendering the content; as noted in the above-cited analysis in the Office Action, these providers provide content to the edit module for rendering.

In view of the above, Claim 1 is deemed patentable over Currans. Dependent Claims 2 - 6 and 11 are therefore deemed patentable by virtue of (at least) the patentability of Claim 1 from which they depend.

The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection of all claims as currently presented.

III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/

Marcia L. Doubet  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168  
Phone: 407-343-7586  
Fax: 407-343-7587